



Police Chiefs' Association of Saginaw County
4930 Shattuck Road
Saginaw, Michigan 48603

Federal ID# 38-2952292
Michigan PSO # PS 13617

Donald Mawer
President

Ronald Trepkowski
Vice President

Donald Pussehl
Secretary/Treasurer

Alva Swearengin
Trustee

Steven Kocsis
Trustee

Dear Representative Cotter:

October 6, 2013

I would like to thank you for participating in the Town Hall meeting on Friday (September 27, 2013) facilitated by Representative Tim Kelly at Thomas Township Hall in Saginaw County. Many facets of the Saginaw County Criminal Justice System and Community weighed in and explained how this proposed movement (elimination of a Judge position) will negatively affect our mission in Saginaw County which has been and is to make this county a safer more economically prosperous area and remove it from the most violent cities per capita list in the nation. I would like to recap some of the issues at hand affecting our system.

- As a proactive measure in 2010 the Saginaw County Circuit took a proactive measure and allowed some felony cases to be re-assigned and adjudicated in the District Court. Judge Boyd within a short time was able to clear 125 felony cases from the overburdened Circuit Court Docket. This was in the face of losing a magistrate position earlier. Without this position filled our system will without a doubt return to an overburdened ineffective system. Who will pick up this case load and take care of the misdemeanor cases, traffic, arraignments, preliminary exams etc. Judge Boyd was performing?
- Losing this position will have a devastating impact on law enforcement agencies overtime budgets due to the District Court handling traffic cases. It is not uncommon to have an officer subpoenaed to 2-3 different traffic cases spread throughout the day causing the agency to pay overtime for all this ineffective scheduling not to mention the sleep deprivation effecting officer safety experienced by the officer.
- The Saginaw County Board of Commissioner have already committed financially to this position in the upcoming budget in the face of tough financial times. They understand the importance of this position as it related to the safety and economical vitality to Saginaw County.

- The statistics provided to support this proposal appear to be suspect at best. Statistics can be manipulated to support either side of any situation. Such an important decision should not be made on mere statistics. There are always other matters to be considered and it does not appear it was in this proposal.
- During this meeting there was no support for this proposal. All those in attendance were adamant this is the wrong thing to do and will result in taking a huge step backwards in the face of rising violent crime.

In closing, this proposal has no viable means of making Saginaw a safer place which is in direct contradiction to Governor Rick Snyder's plan and promise to the State of Michigan. Saginaw was labeled by the Governor as one of four crime ridden cities which he was "committed" to focus crime suppression efforts. The Saginaw County Police Chiefs Association is opposed to the elimination of the Judgeship position as proposed. This proposal promises nothing positive for Saginaw County and will erase the progress setting Saginaw County back years in the progress which has been made. This is not a viable solution to whatever problem the State Court Administrators Office is attempting to solve. We urge you and your committee to do the right thing and stop this proposal based on common sense, the information summarized at the meeting, and the information supplied in the State Court Administrators report. If you have any further questions please feel free to contact our organization. We look forward to discussing this matter further.

Sincerely:

Donald Mawer

Donald Mawer
President, Saginaw County Police Chiefs Association

cc: Representative Tim Kelly, Saginaw County Board of Commissioners, Honorable
Randell Jurrens, Honorable Frederick Borchard, Prosecutor John McClogan

AMEND PAGE 14, LINE 21, STRIKE:

HOWEVER, THE FIRST DIVISION HAS 2 JUDGES BEGINNING ON THE DATE ON WHICH A VACANCY OCCURS IN THE OFFICE OF DISTRICT JUDGE IN THE FIRST DIVISION UNLESS THE VACANCY OCCURS AFTER A JUDGE'S SUCCESSOR IN OFFICE HAS BEEN ELECTED BUT BEFORE THAT SUCCESSOR TAKES OFFICE, OR THE BEGINNING DATE OF THE TERM FOR WHICH AN INCUMBENT DISTRICT JUDGE IN THE FIRST DIVISION NO LONGER SEEKS ELECTION OR REELECTION TO THAT OFFICE, WHICHEVER IS EARLIER.

AMEND PAGE 15, LINE 4, STRIKE "2" AND INSERT "3".

AMEND PAGE 15, LINE 5, STRIKE:

HOWEVER, THE SECOND DIVISION HAS 3 JUDGES BEGINNING ON THE DATE ON WHICH A VACANCY OCCURS IN THE OFFICE OF DISTRICT JUDGE IN THE FIRST DIVISION, UNLESS THE VACANCY OCCURS AFTER A JUDGE'S SUCCESSOR IN OFFICE HAS BEEN ELECTED BUT BEFORE THAT SUCCESSOR TAKES OFFICE, OR THE BEGINNING DATE OF THE TERM FOR WHICH AN INCUMBENT DISTRICT JUDGE IN THE FIRST DIVISION NO LONGER SEEKS ELECTION OR REELECTION TO THAT OFFICE, WHICHEVER IS EARLIER. THE JUDGESHIP TRANSFERRED FROM THE FIRST DIVISION TO THE SECOND DIVISION IS NOT CONSIDERED AN ADDITIONAL JUDGESHIP FOR PURPOSES OF SECTION 8175 AND MAY BE FILLED BY APPOINTMENT BY THE GOVERNOR IF IT IS THE RESULT OF A VACANCY IN THE FIRST DIVISION.